UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE           | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/694,037   | 10/27/2003            | Cynthia T. Clague    | P-11210.00          | 3891             |
| 27581 7590 03/06/2007<br>MEDTRONIC, INC.<br>710 MEDTRONIC PARK<br>MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924 |                       |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  |                       |                      | KOTINI, PAVITRA     |                  |
| MINNEAPOL  | 15, MIN 55452-9924    |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |                       |                      | 3731                |                  |
|  |                       | ·                    |                     |                  |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR   | LY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
| 31 E   | DAYS                  | 03/06/2007           | DADED               |                  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| 8 | P |
|---|---|
| Ď | ľ |

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/694,037  | CLAGUE ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  | Pavitra Kotini  | 3731   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Oc   | <u>ctober 2003</u> .  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This   | action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar  | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45  | 53 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.   | vn from consideration.  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce  | epted or b) objected to by the I  | Examiner.  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the  | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See   | ∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti  | , , , , , ,   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | aminer. Note the attached Office  | Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of   | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   | on No<br>ed in this National Stage   |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  | _   |  |  |  |  |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:  | ate  |  |  |  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-34, drawn to a cutting instrument, classified in class 606, subclass 167.
- II. Claims 35-46, drawn to a method of making a slit, classified in class 128, subclass 898.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and II are related as apparatus for its practice and process. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as a corneal cutter or a scissor-type cutter.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 3731

This application also contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct

species:

- A. The species of figures 13-16
- B. The species of figures 17, 18
- C. The species of figures 19-24

The species are independent or distinct because Inventions A, B, and C are directed to related species. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a materially different design and mode of operation. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Applicant is <u>also</u> required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no generic claims.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was made to Attorney on 2/26/07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/694,037

Art Unit: 3731

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pavitra Kotini whose telephone number is 571-272-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PK AU 3731 2/26/07

ANHTUANT. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5